

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 8, and 21 have been amended. New independent claim 39 has been added. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-11, and 14-39 are pending in the current application. Applicants also wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 21, 25-26, 29-32, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,901,037 to Hamilton et al. (“Hamilton 037”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,692,558 to Hamilton et al. (“Hamilton 558”). Claims 1 and 21 have been amended to recite, in part, that the cavited inlet end cap and the cavited outlet end cap have “a width equal to the width of the low profile metal unitary member.” As indicated in the Interview Summary, “...the manifold/end cap having the same width with the low profiled device (20) appear to overcome the applied prior art.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 1 and 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 6, 25-26, 29-32, and 37 are either directly or indirectly dependent from one of claims 1 or 21 and should distinguish over the combination of Hamilton 037 and Hamilton 558 for at least the same reasons as stated above. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 3, 6, 25-26, 29-32, and 37 be withdrawn.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hamilton 037 and Hamilton 558 in view of Applicants’ omission of known/conventional prior art. Claim 4 is directly dependent on claim 1 and should distinguish over Hamilton 037 and Hamilton 558 for at least the same reasons as stated above. Applicants’ omission of known prior art does not remedy the deficiencies of Hamilton 037 and Hamilton 558 in that the known prior art does not teach or suggest an inlet or outlet end cap having a width equal to the width of the low profile metal unitary member. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 9, 27, 28, 33, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hamilton 037 in view of Benson et al. Applicants have reviewed our records and cannot locate any reference to Benson et al in order to determine the patent number for this

reference. Claim 8 has been amended to recite, in part, that the cavited inlet end cap and the cavited outlet end cap have a width equal to the width of the low profile metal unitary member. Applicants believe that the amendments to claim 8 distinguish over the combination of Hamilton 037, Hamilton 558, and Benson et al in view of the comments stated in the Interview Summary.

Claims 9, 27, 28, 33, and 38 are either directly or indirectly dependent from one of claims 8 or 21 and should distinguish over the combination of Hamilton 037, Hamilton 558, and Benson et al for at least the same reasons as stated above. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 9, 27, 28, 33, and 38 be withdrawn.

Claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hamilton 037 in view of Benson et al and further in view of Hamilton 558. Claims 10 and 11 are either directly or indirectly dependent from claim 8 and should distinguish over Hamilton 037 and Benson et al for at least the same reasons as stated above. Hamilton 558 does not remedy the deficiencies of Hamilton 037 and Benson et al as noted above with respect to claims 1 and 21. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 11 distinguish over the combination of Hamilton 037, Benson et al, and Hamilton 558 and request that the §103 rejection of claims 10 and 11 be withdrawn.

Claims 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hamilton 037 in view of Hamilton 558 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,285,347 to Fox et al. ("Fox"). Claims 22 and 23 are either directly or indirectly dependent on one of claims 1 or 21 and should distinguish over Hamilton 037 and Hamilton 558 for at least the same reasons as stated above. In addition, Fox does not remedy the deficiencies of Hamilton 037 and Hamilton 558 as indicated by the Interview Summary. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 22 and 23 distinguish over the combination of Hamilton 037, Hamilton 558 and Fox and request that the §103 rejection of claims 22 and 23 be withdrawn.

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hamilton 037 in view of Benson et al. and further in view of Fox. As noted above with respect to claims 1, 8, and 21, Hamilton 037, Benson, and Fox do not teach a cavited inlet end cap and a cavited outlet end cap having a width equal to the width of the low profile metal unitary member.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24 distinguishes over the combination of Hamilton 037, Benson et al, and Fox and request that the §103 rejection of claim 24 be withdrawn.

Claims 34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hamilton 037 in view of Hamilton 558 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,032,726 to Wright et al. (“Wright”). As noted above, none of the cited references, including Wright, teach or suggest a cavited inlet end cap and a cavited outlet end cap having a width equal to the width of the low profile metal unitary member. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 34 and 36 be withdrawn.

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hamilton 037 in view of Benson et al and further in view of Wright. As set forth above, Hamilton 037, Benson et al, and Wright do not teach or suggest a cavited inlet end cap and a cavited outlet end cap having a width equal to the width of the low profile metal unitary member. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

New independent claim 39 recites, in part, a cavited inlet end cap and a cavited outlet end cap that are disposed “in direct contact with at least a portion of the at least one heat generating component.” As noted in the Interview Summary, “heat generating devices mounted beneath the manifold/end cap...appear to overcome the applied prior art.” As such, Applicants believe that new claim 39 distinguishes over the art of record.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: 4/28/04

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Ashley N. Moore

Registration No.: 51,667

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

(214) 855-4300 (Fax)